

**REMARKS**

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-8, 20, and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FARLEY et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0018293) in view of MOLES et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,024,557); and rejects claims 2 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FARLEY et al. in view of MOLES et al. and further in view of BIMS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,911). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections<sup>1</sup>. Claims 1-8 and 20-27 remain pending.

Claims 1, 3-8, 20, and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over FARLEY et al. in view of MOLES et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For example, claim 1 recites a method for secure message reception from a plurality of remote devices. The method includes receiving a message at a controller; obtaining, by the controller, a reverse channel address associated with the received message; determining, by the controller, whether the received message is associated with at least one of the remote devices; forwarding the message and the reverse channel address to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of the remote devices; determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address; and routing the received message to the destination address. FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons for modifying a reference and/or combining references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

For example, FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al. do not disclose or suggest forwarding a message and a reverse channel address to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of a plurality of remote devices and determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner relies on Fig. 7 and paragraph 0094-0098 (which describe Fig. 7) of FARLEY et al. and Fig. 1, column 4, lines 7-13, column 5, lines 43-49 (which describes Fig. 1), and column 6, lines 13-21 of MOLES et al. as allegedly disclosing these features of claim 1 (final Office Action, pp. 3-4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al.

At paragraphs 0094-0098, FARLEY et al. discloses forwarding a network message from a PC device to a server via a wireless link between a subscriber unit and a base station. This section of FARLEY et al. further discloses that both the base station and the subscriber unit simultaneously track each established session based on a 16-bit L4 stream identifier tag that includes a source IP address, destination IP address, source port number, and destination port number. This section of FARLEY et al. does not disclose or suggest determining, at a routing server, a destination address for a received message based on a reverse channel address. Rather, as noted above, FARLEY et al. discloses that each session is assigned an L4 stream ID tag that includes a source IP address and a destination IP address. Therefore, this section of FARLEY et al. does not disclose or suggest forwarding a message and a reverse channel address to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of a plurality of remote devices and determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address, as recited in claim 1. Rather, this section of FARLEY et al. clearly

discloses that the information transmitted between the base station and the subscriber unit includes the destination address as part of the L4 stream ID tag.

At column 4, lines 7-13, MOLES et al. discloses:

According to another embodiment of the present invention, the first controller is disposed in a mobile switching center of the wireless network. In other embodiments of the present invention, the first controller may be disposed in an interworking function unit of the wireless network, or may be partitioned between the mobile switching center and the interworking function unit.

This section of MOLES et al. discloses that a controller may be disposed in an interworking function unit of a wireless network or may be portioned between a mobile switching center and an interworking function unit. This section of MOLES et al. discloses a controller in a wireless network and does not have anything to do with determining a destination address for a received message based on a reverse channel address. Therefore, this section of MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest forwarding a message and a reverse channel address to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of a plurality of remote devices and determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address, as recited in claim 1.

At column 5, lines 43-49, MOLES et al. discloses:

FIG. 1 illustrates a general overview of an exemplary wireless network 100 according to one embodiment of the present invention. The wireless telephone network 100 comprises a plurality of cell sites 121 123, each containing one of the base stations, BS 101, BS 102, or BS 103. Base stations 101 103 are operable to communicate with a plurality of mobile stations (MS) 111-114.

This section of MOLES et al. discloses a wireless telephone network that includes a plurality of cell sites that each contain a base station that are operable to communicate with a plurality of mobile stations. This section of MOLES et al. has nothing to do with determining a destination address for a received message based on a reverse channel address. Therefore, this section of MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest forwarding a message and a reverse channel address

to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of a plurality of remote devices and determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address, as recited in claim 1.

At column 6, lines 13-21, MOLES et al. discloses:

BS 101, BS 102 and BS 103 transfer voice and data signals between each other and the public telephone system (not shown) via communications line 131 and mobile switching center (MSC) 140. Mobile switching center 140 is well known to those skilled in the art. Mobile switching center 140 is a switching device that provides services and coordination between the subscribers in a wireless network and external networks, such as the public telephone system and/or the Internet.

This section of MOLES et al. discloses a mobile switching center that provides services and coordination between subscribers in a wireless network and external network, such as the public telephone system and/or the Internet. This section of MOLES et al. has nothing to do with determining a destination address for a received message based on a reverse channel address. Therefore, this section of MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest forwarding a message and a reverse channel address to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of a plurality of remote devices and determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 3-8 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 3-8 are patentable over FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al.

For example, claim 6 recites determining whether the received message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server. The

Examiner relies on column 8, line 59 – column 9, line 8 of MOLES et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of MOLES et al.

At column 8, line 59 – column 9, line 8, MOLES et al. discloses:

Authentication controller 260 initially stores incoming data from MS 112 and compares the received SSD information with SSD information retrieved from HLR 155. If authentication controller 260 determines that the received SSD information from MS 112 is valid, then authentication controller 260 examines other data stored in HLR 155, such as NAM data and billing information, to determine if MS 112 has been provisioned. If authentication controller 260 verifies that MS 112 is properly provisioned, the voice/data call is transferred to MSC 140 for normal call processing. If authentication controller 260 determines that MS 112 has not been previously provisioned (i.e., no billing information, no NAM data, etc.), authentication controller 260 transfers all incoming IP packets to provisioning security controller 265 for encryption and transfer to provisioning server 160 through MSC 140 and Internet 165, as described below in greater detail.

This section of MOLES et al. discloses that, if a mobile station has been provisioned, a voice/data call is transferred for normal processing and if the mobile station has not been provisioned, an authentication controller transfers all incoming IP packets to a provisioning security controller for encryption and transfer to a provisioning server. This section of MOLES et al. is not related to and does not mention a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server. Therefore, this section of MOLES et al. cannot disclose or suggest determining whether the received message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server, as recited in claim 6.

In response to the above remarks, the Examiner alleges that “Moles discloses provisioning server has the key to the encryption algorithm used by base station, provisioning server is able to process legitimate service provisioning requests from mobile station, as such provisioning server is a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server” and relies on column 10, lines 5-8 of MOLES et al. for support. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation.

At column 10, lines 5-8, MOLES et al. discloses that the provisioning server has the key to an encryption algorithm used by a base station. This section of MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest determining whether the received message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server, as recited in claim 6.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable over FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 20 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable over FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 23-27 depend from claim 20. Therefore, these claims are patentable over FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al.

For example, claim 25 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 6. Therefore, claim 25 is patentable over FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Claims 2 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over FARLEY et al. in view of MOLES et al. and further in view of BIMS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 20. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 21, Applicants submit that the disclosure of BIMS et

al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of FARLEY et al. and MOLES et al. set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 20. Therefore, claims 2 and 21 are patentable over FARLEY et al., MOLES et al., and BIMS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60,112/  
Meagan S. Walling  
Reg. No. 60,112

Date: May 20, 2008  
11350 Random Hills Road  
Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 25537